

**REMARKS**

The applicant appreciates the consideration provided by the examiner in the office action mailed October 28, 2009. The status of each presented in this paper is as follows: claim 1 is currently amended; claims 2-6 are previously presented; and claims 7-9 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-6 are therefore currently pending.

The amendment to claim 1 is presented to correct a heretofore unnoticed typographical error. No new matter is added. The applicant respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

**Interview Summary**

The applicant also appreciates the courtesy extended to the applicant's representative by the examiner in a telephonic interview conducted November 19, 2009. During the interview, the examiner and the representative discussed independent claim 7 in detail, and discussed the prior art reference Appel, U.S. Patent No. 3,192,551 ("Appel"). The representative asserted that the novel method recited in claim 1 produces a wiper blade (as recited in claim 7) that is structurally different from those produced by prior art methods, include any methods described in Appel. Specifically, the curvature and/or rigidity of virtually divided regions of the backing of a wiper according to claim 7 would be set such that a sum of variation differences of contact pressures at respective discretized points of a wiping surface would be minimized. FIG. 6 of the present application, for example, illustrates the measurements of the curvatures of the virtually divided regions of the backing of the blade shown in FIG. 4(a), the curvatures having been set according to the method of claim 1.

The applicants asserts that while prior art references including Appel may have as an objective providing a uniform pressure on a windshield (see Appel at column 2, lines 24-27), the methods disclosed therein will not produce a blade as described in claim 7, wherein the contact pressure of the blade is *most unified*. See the applicant's specification at page 11, lines 2-4. That is to say, the office action has not shown *prima facie* how in Appel, the numerous characteristics of the backing (curvature, thickness, width, elasticity, length, etc.) are manipulated to produce the rigidity and/or curvature of the backing of a blade according to claim 7. The examiner and the representative disagreed on this point.

Allowable Subject Matter

The applicant appreciates the indication in the office action that claims 1-6 are allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Appel. Additionally, claims 7 and 8 were rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Maiocco, U.S. Patent 4,336,625 (“Maiocco”). For the reasons describe above in the interview summary, the applicant respectfully traverses that any method described in Apple and Maiocco would produce a wiper blade according to claim 7, wherein the backing of the blade is produced according to the method of claim 1. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicant has canceled claims 7-9 herein, leaving only allowed claims 1-6 pending.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone. If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

/James M. Alpert/

---

James M. Alpert  
Reg. No. 59,926

Posz Law Group, PLC  
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101  
Reston, VA 20191  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400